

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/423,974	01/05/2000	NADIA TERREN	05725.0490	7391
7:	590 09/10/2002			
FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW EXAMINER				INER
GARRETT & I		BERMAN, ALYSIA		
1300 I STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 200053315				
WASHINGTO	14, DC 200033313		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
			DATE MAILED: 09/10/2002 43	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

÷.	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/423,974	TERREN ET AL.			
,, , ,	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Alysia Berman	1617			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 07 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) \( \square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);				
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.		
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	l be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: _		sidered but does NO	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>75-80,82-94 and 96-107</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 108.					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Exan	niner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).				
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>			•		
	F	RUSPET TRAVERS RIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1200			

Myrio B

Continuation of 10. Other: The claims are rejected for reasons of record in the final Office Action mailed May 7, 2002, paper no. 11. Applicant's arguments addressing the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections have been previously addressed in paper no. 11. In response to Applicant's traversal of the withdrawal of claim 108 as being directed to a non-elected invention, the invention of claim 108 was constructively non-elected by original presentation. Applicant has already received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention of a composition, which did not encompass the invention of claim 108 of a method of making a composition. Therefore, withdrawal of claim 108 is proper. Applicant's arguments that the phrase, "an amount effective to provide transfer-resistant properties to the composition" clearly delineates the metes and bounds of the claimed invention is not found persuasive. Neither the specification nor the claims clearly defines the phrase, "transfer-resistant" nor do they disclose an amount or range of amounts effective to provide this transfer resistance. Without such guidance, one of ordinary skill in the art cannot determine the amount needed to provide transfer resistant properties to the composition.